

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 10/772,138	Applicant(s) AHMED ET AL.
		Examiner SHERMAN LIN	Art Unit 2447

All Participants:

(1) SHERMAN LIN.

(2) _____

Date of Interview: 19 October 2010

Status of Application: _____

(3) George R. Rapacki (#60770).

(4) _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 19, 37, 55, 64, 71, 78, 88, 98

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amendments to further clarify a designation step of designating a CCA-capable node as a Responding CCA-capable node when $TLAST < (\text{current time} - 2(T1))$ is true for each CCA-capable node. Additionally, the examiner proposed clarifying TLAST as the time when a message from a current gateway CCA is received and clarifying T1 as a predetermined time period..